

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-9 remain in the application. Claim 5 has been amended.

In item 1 on pages 2-3 of the above-identified Office action, the Examiner has stated that Applicant's replacement drawing submitted on 9/18/04, which shows a "black box" as the bending joint, does not overcome the drawing defect.

Applicants disagree with the Examiner's arguments for the following reasons:

1. It is stated on page 14, line 25 to page 15, line 2 of the specification that "For its part, the sensing arm 12 is suitably secured to a carrier device at its other end, which is not illustrated in more detail in Fig. 1." Consequently, Applicants state in the description of Fig. 1 that depicting the securing configuration in detail is not necessary for understanding the invention of the instant application. Therefore, Applicants believe that the "one line diagram" overcomes the drawing objection.

2. It should be recognized that Fig. 3 already shows a sensing arm 12 and a carrier device 56. The description on page 19, line 1 of the specification states "the sensing arms 12 are arranged on a common carrier body 56." The arrangement is not necessarily a "securing configuration," but is broader. Therefore, a one-line diagram is proper to show this broad concept. The language of claim 5 has been amended accordingly.

3. Claim 5 has broad claim language, but the broad language is nevertheless clear. In the description on page 10, lines 8-10 of the specification, Applicants state, "the sensing arm is advantageously mounted on the carrier body via a bending joint." Further, on page 15, lines 13-14 of the specification, Applicants state, "the sensing arm 12 may also be provided with a bending joint." As there is no further information given with regard to the bending joint, it should be accepted that numerous bending joints having different degrees of freedom and different purposes are claimed by claim 5. Indeed, the bending joint and its connection to the other elements are claimed in claim 5 regardless of their form and specific behavior. It is neither necessary nor important to show these features in detail for a proper understanding of the invention.

Applicants are, therefore, of the opinion that the amended Fig. 1 is in proper form to overcome the drawing objection.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-9 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Please charge any fees which might be due with respect to 37 CFR Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicants

YONGHONG CHEN
REG. NO. 56,150

YC

December 6, 2004

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101